

THE TREATY.

Another Day in Senatorial Executive Session on the Supplemental Disgrace.

Thurman Arraigns the Administration.

CARPENTER DENOUNCES THE SURRENDER.

The Strange Story of Fish's Bad Faith.

Trembling Tergiversation Plucked Up by the Roots.

THE LOST COPY OF OUR "CASE."

Cumulative Evidence Against Fish.

The Administration Betrayed—The Senate Deceived.

WHAT BUTLER'S RESOLUTION MEANS.

The Pro and Con in Debate To-Day.

NO RESULT YET REACHED.

WASHINGTON, May 24, 1872.

The consideration of the Treaty of Washington in executive session of the Senate reached its climax to-day. Strangely enough, the chief point of interest in that body was the question raised by Sir Stafford Northcote in his speech some days ago, and previously referred to by Sir Edward Thornton in his little talk to the St. George's Society of New York. The resolution which

GENERAL BUTLER INTRODUCED INTO THE HOUSE, and which still hangs fire in that body, contains all the essential features on which the Senate debate on this question hinged itself. In order to get a clear understanding of the whole matter it is necessary to go back to the beginning of the controversy in regard to the demand for consequential or indirect or national damages before the Geneva Tribunal. It will be remembered that

A COPY OF OUR "CASE" WAS LOST some time last fall, weeks before the first meeting of the tribunal. The book was dropped out of a carriage by Secretary Fish and Mr. William M. Everts, and its loss was the subject of inquiry by Mr. Eldridge, of Wisconsin. Mr. Fish never answered the resolution, and an answer was not pressed for the reason that the sole object of its introduction was to

PREVENT PREVARICATION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE on the subject of its loss. The government offered a reward for the book at the time, in an advertisement published in the newspapers of Washington, but the character of the book was not specified in the advertisement, and nothing was said respecting it further than that it was lost in a certain local city. The book was never recovered, notwithstanding it was a confidential document, which had never been sent to the Senate. At the time the State Department was exceedingly anxious to ascertain if the British government had obtained possession of it.

The feeling among the officials of the Department and the counsel for the United States before the tribunal at Geneva was that this book, which contained everything about our case, including the vexed question of consequential damages, and which had been allowed to fall into the streets of Washington by the Secretary of State himself, could not be used by the British government in the preparation of the English case without betraying the fact of the possession of the lost copy, if such possession was a fact. It was well understood that the British government was fully advised of every species of claims which could legitimately come before the Geneva Tribunal under the treaty, according to the understanding of its scope by the Commissioners who had framed it.

IF ANY ALLUSION HAD BEEN MADE

The English case, filed at Geneva in December, to the claim for consequential damages, it would have been taken to mean, by our State Department people, that such allusion had only got into the English statement through the lost copy. Our government, as well as the English government, so thoroughly understood the question of direct losses that each side was well informed long before the tribunal met as to the positions and arguments of the other. Our amateur diplomats, therefore, owing to the fact that a copy of our case had been lost were only anxious as to the position which England would assume on the question of indirect damage losses. This was the situation of affairs when the first British case was received at the State Department, and when the question was asked whether the British case showed any evidence that the lost book had fallen into English hands, the answer of one of the American counsel was that it did not. To the next question, what good reason was there for believing that the British government had not obtained possession of the lost copy, the significant reply was made, because there is a chapter in our case which would be

A GREAT SURPRISE TO GREAT BRITAIN, a surprise which the English could not have anticipated without showing that they had possession of an advance copy of our case. This declaration, made on the authority of one of the American counsel, is in accordance with the statements made by Earl Grey in the House of Lords last June and Sir Stafford Northcote in the House of Commons last August, long before any question arose as to the interpretation of the treaty.

In the despatch of Earl Granville to General Schenck on the 20th March, alluding to the debate in Parliament on the 12th June, before the exchange of ratifications, he says:—

That Her Majesty's government never intended to refer these claims to arbitration, and that in ratifying the treaty they never contemplated their being revived in the argument before the arbitrators, must have been obvious to you from the language used in the debate in the House of Lords on the 12th June, on the motion for an address to the Queen praying Her Majesty to refuse to ratify the treaty. On that occasion I distinctly stated that it was the understanding of Her Majesty's government, and quoted the very protocol of the 4th May, to which I have referred above, as a proof that these indirect claims, to whose speech allusion has been made in the United States Congress, subsequently said that extraneous claims might be put in and take their chance he was met with an expression of dissent. Moreover, Lord Derby, while criticizing the nego-

tiation and terms of the treaty in other respects, specifically mentioned the withdrawal of indirect claims. The only concession, he said, "of which I can see any trace upon the American side is the withdrawal of that utterly preposterous demand that we should be responsible for the premature recognition of the South as a belligerent Power, in company with that equally preposterous demand which I believe never extended beyond the minds of two or three speakers in Congress, of making us liable for all constructive damages to trade and navigation, which may be proved or supposed to have arisen from our attitude during the war. Those demands would, however, never have been admitted by any arbitration, and we therefore derived no advantage from their withdrawal." Earl Grey and Sir Stafford Northcote, who negotiated the treaty, replied to Earl Derby's remarks by denying that the course taken by the English Commissioners at Washington had been one of uniform concession to their American colleagues. It was easy to say that the latter had given up no claim which would have been entertained by any arbitration; but it was far more difficult to hear an express surrender of those which had been referred to by the noble Earl (Earl Derby).

Earl Granville, continuing his despatch to Schenck, says:—

I observed that you were present in the House of Lords on that occasion, and your information of the 16th of December that you were present during the speeches of Lord Russell and myself and that you communicated the next day the full newspaper report of the debate to your government. Sir S. Northcote, in the House of Commons, repeated in other words the substance of my remarks on the limitation of the terms of ratification, and as his speech is printed in the papers on Foreign Relations recently laid before Congress, it must also have been reported to your government; but neither on the occasion of my speech, nor of his, nor when the ratifications of the treaty were exchanged on the 17th of June, did you call my attention to the fact that different interpretations were placed on the treaty and protocol by Her Majesty's government and the government of the United States, nor so far as Her Majesty's government was aware was their interpretation thus publicly expressed challenged either by the statesmen or the public press of the United States.

The remarks referred to as made by Sir Stafford Northcote on the treaty on the 4th August last are as follows:—

The claims arising out of the acts of the Alabama and other vessels were most clearly defined in the treaty. The honorable member for Richmond had remarked that the previous conventions felt many points vague, and introduced a number of claims which we could not have admitted. They were left vague, indeed, that it would have been possible, under those claims to have raised a number of questions which this country was not willing to submit to arbitration. The arbitration raised questions with regard to what they called England's premature recognition of belligerency and the consequential damages arising from the prolongation of the war, and with regard also to other questions which this country could not have admitted. Instead of this being the case, however, the treaty as actually concluded narrowed the questions at issue very closely by confining the reference solely to losses growing out of the acts of particular vessels, and so shutting out a large class of claims upon which the Americans had heretofore insisted. He contended, therefore, that the Joint High Commission had upon this point worked substantial advantage rather than injury to this country.

These speeches seem to justify the recent remarks of Sir Edward Thornton and especially of Sir Stafford Northcote. It will be remembered that Sir Edward Thornton, the British Minister, in the speech already referred to in this despatch, at the St. George's dinner in New York, where he spoke for both the American and British Commissioners, took the ground that the presentation of the American claim for consequential damages was a surprise to the English Commissioners and

THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

Sir Stafford Northcote in his Exeter Hall speech last week is reported to have said:—

The understanding of the British Commissioners was that a promise had been given that the claims for consequential damages should not be presented, but it was necessary that the American Senate should not be placed in a position requiring a confession that wrong had been done.

This speech was made the subject of General Butler's resolution, which, so far, he has failed to have passed by the House. If it passes there will be great trouble at the State Department. Mr. Fish cannot give a straightforward, unequivocal answer, and it is asserted by the friends of the Secretary that General Butler, as a friend of the administration, would not have introduced the resolution if his

HOSTILITY TO THE TREATY.

and his wish for its failure had not overborne party considerations. It has been well known in certain official quarters ever since the dispute began, that the British Commissioners have time and again suggested in a private way that they are in possession of documentary and contemporaneous evidence which, though not of an official character, is amply sufficient to establish circumstantially the position of the English government that the indirect claims should not have been introduced into our "case." The British Cabinet has studiously refrained from officially or

OPENLY USING THIS EVIDENCE up to this time, because to reveal it would fasten the imputation of absolute bad faith upon the United States officials, and make it impossible to hold any claims under the treaty. The knowledge that this evidence existed, or was alleged to exist, has been a source of unrelenting anxiety and embarrassment to Mr. Fish through the whole course of the negotiations.

DID FISH DECEIVE THE COUNTRY?

This leaves only the hypothesis of lying for the Commissioners on one side or the other, and reveals to us the danger that Mr. Fish first deceived the British Commissioners, then the Senate to secure the ratification of the treaty, and finally the Senate and the country in order to secure for himself a retreat from the endless blundering which characterizes his official conduct. And it was this subject which engaged the attention of the Senate to-day in executive session. Both Thurman and Sherman, the Ohio Senators, took very strong grounds against the whole transaction.

Thurman, while not indicating that he would vote against the ratification of the supplementary article, took an unexpected view of the situation, going into the merits of the case as it has already been explained in this despatch, and deprecating the entire situation. He denounced Mr. Fish's diplomacy as a series of blunders from the beginning, and if he indicated a disposition to agree to ratification, as it is averred he did, it is understood that he did so only on the ground that these blunders have been so great and have gone so far as

NOW TO BE BEYOND REMEDY.

He thought that, under all the circumstances, it would have been better if the Senate had ratified the Johnson-Clarendon Treaty, objectionable as it was, as the country would thereby have escaped the complicated position in which it now finds itself. It would have been a wise act, he said, if we could have foreseen the trouble that has followed and the agony which has recently been displayed, to have accepted that convention, instead of progressing

IN THE DIRECTION OF HUMILIATION, as we have been doing since its rejection. He was particularly severe in his arraignment of the administration, quoting from the President's Message and Fish's correspondence to show the advantages which have been gradually gained over us by the superior diplomacy of Great Britain. His speech was followed by one from Mr. Carpenter, who very directly asserted his opposition to the pending proposition, repeating his previous arguments against it and advocating

THE PRINCIPLE OF THE UNITED STATES of all the claims held by our citizens for direct damages, for the purpose of holding them in abeyance against Great Britain. Mr. Carpenter alluded to the demands of Gladstone as insults, and earnestly besought his fellow Senators to punish such insolence as it deserves. Another Senator, alluding to the State Department interview, at which the President was present, disclosed outside of the Senate that if the determination

THEN EXPRESSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION, which was to adhere to a settlement of the principle of indirect claims, had been carried out the existing troubles would not have occurred, and that country would have now the proud satisfaction of appearing in the attitude of consistently urging the solution of a great principle.

The trouble about this view is that Mr. Fish and one or two of his colleagues had sacrificed or agreed before the treaty was ratified or even signed. The exposure of this fact and the consequent

tion of the correspondence in the HERALD is entirely due to the same fact, for it exposed him to the risk of the very discussion which took place in the Senate to-day and provoked the hostile resolution of inquiry, which it will be impossible to answer if it passes the House. Sir Stafford Northcote made his Exeter Hall speech on the same day when the correspondence printed in the HERALD was published in England. That speech revealed the line of argument

CONTENDED FOR BY THE ENGLISH THROUGHOUT the whole controversy, and showed that he adhered with wonderful tenacity to the position that indirect damages were not to be included among the demands of the United States. It has long been a question how ten intelligent men could have been together for weeks to settle questions of the magnitude of these presented to the Joint High Commission without

COMING TO A COMPLETE UNDERSTANDING on all the claims under consideration. While three of the English Commissioners have declared that the question of our national losses was waived before the treaty was agreed upon at all, none of the American Commissioners, except Mr. Fish, in his official correspondence, has uttered a word on the subject. The English do not regard Mr. Fish's correspondence with General Schenck as merely the correspondence of the American Secretary of State, but criticize his declarations as the utterances of a member of the Joint High Commission. It was this view which Sir Stafford Northcote took when he found that his own previously published statement was a lie, if the statement of Mr. Fish, as published in the correspondence was true. It frequently has been asked on what authority the British Commissioners assume to speak both for themselves and for the American Commissioners on a point about which there has been so much dispute. The reason assigned is that the British Commissioners are prepared to show by documentary evidence that their public declarations are correct and that

THE INDIRECT CLAIMS HAD BEEN WAIVED by the American Commissioners. On the other hand, it was asserted some time ago that Mr. Fish had evidence equally conclusive to show that the contrary was the truth. It is reported here that Northcote's statement is to be supported by the other British Members of the Joint High Commission, and that they will make a complete and circumstantial defence. Further than this it is known that General Schenck repeatedly said during the negotiations that the claim for indirect losses had been waived by the agreement to refer the direct losses to arbitration. In a conversation with Senator Sumner, Dr. Grey and Northcote talked the whole matter over and

THE SENATOR LEARNED FROM THEM for the first time that the administration had agreed to waive the claim for national losses so earnestly contended for by him in his speech against the Johnson-Clarendon Convention. The question as to whether Mr. Sumner represented the views of the administration at the time of the rejection of that convention came up in subsequent conversations, and the British Commissioners were assured that if the Senator had not said a word on the subject the convention would have been rejected on account of

THE DINING AND WINING POLICY pursued toward Secretary Johnson. In view of all these conflicting statements and the tortuous policy of Mr. Fish, it is not to be wondered that he was anxious to save the treaty, and dined and wineed Thornton and Gurney in order to fix up a matter so dear to him and so hurtful to the people. On the 23d of April, Mr. Gurney, the British Commissioner in the British-American Claim Commission, dined with Secretary Fish, prior to his departure for Europe. Up to that time he had no confidence in the treaty being saved. At the dinner

THE SYSTEMATIC PROSECUTION FOR A BACK-DOWN was discussed, and Mr. Fish assured Mr. Gurney that this government did not want a cent of money, but that the question had been presented simply as a matter of form in order to prevent Great Britain presenting under similar circumstances a like claim. Mr. Gurney laughed at the sober statement of Fish, and said if the United States would so present that statement to his government that he was sure it would be accepted by the English government, and thus end the unhappy controversy. Mr. Gurney left the residence of Secretary Fish a convert to his back-down policy, and announced that

HE WOULD GO ALL IN HIS POWER on returning to England to strengthen the position yielded by Mr. Fish. On Thursday, April 25, Minister Schenck telegraphed that it appeared too probable that the British government would take such a course as would put an end to the arbitration at Geneva and to the treaty, fully confirming the previous declarations of Russell Gurney. This despatch was read at the session of the Cabinet on the day received, and on April 27 Mr. Fish was authorized to telegraph to Mr. Schenck that we were prepared to back down, and that while England had all along been terrified at our extraordinary demand for money, we did not mean dollars and cents, but merely principle, although on the sum in gross which included indirect losses, we insisted on payment.

INTEREST AT THE RATE OF TEN PER CENT PER ANNUM from July 1, 1863, to July 1, 1872. This despatch was communicated to Granville, and on the following Thursday, May 2, the objectionable proposition of Granville, prompted by Schenck's instructions, was received. This was read at the Cabinet meeting on the 3d inst., and it was then resolved to call together the republican members of the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Relations and Affairs and

HOLD A PARTISAN CONFERENCE, the particulars of which were published in these despatches of May 5. As was stated, the President got but very little consolation from his partisan advisers, and authorized Fish to say to Schenck that he was sorry that Granville did not understand the despatch proposing to back down, and that Her Majesty's government had not seen fit to accept the President's

WILLINGNESS TO RATIFY "HUMBLE PIE." On the 10th May, after several explanatory despatches had been sent as to what would probably be swallowed as a sugar-coated pill by the Senate, came the proposition now pending before the Senate, and which is recorded as a fitting finale to the blundering diplomacy of Secretary Fish. From the day that the moneyed interests of the country prevailed upon the President to save their credit down to the present moment, there has been a gradual weakening on the part of the administration in standing by the position assumed in the diplomatic correspondence. General Schenck, when he telegraphed that

THE "CASE" SEEMED HOPELESS fully believed that the "case" had broken down, if the demand for indirect damages was persisted, and yet he knew that under all the circumstances the only way to save the honor of the country, whatever might become of Secretary Fish, was to let the treaty fall. The matter was again arranged, however, and it came before the Senate, with the understanding that we had finally backed down. The publication of the correspondence in the HERALD and the irritation of Northcote prevented the ready assent to the supplemental article, which was expected, and made

THE SENATE LIVELY TO-DAY. The debate was opened this morning by a speech from Governor Morton, who was followed by Senator Conkling, both of whom earnestly supported the passage of the resolution, advising the President to proceed with the negotiations on the basis of the article as amended by the Foreign Relations Committee. They argued that the principle of arbitration and the precedent of a peaceful solution of warlike differences between nations is at stake, and that the exigencies of the occasion demand more than ordinary gravity in the deliberations of the Senate. The extent of the concession was admitted by them to be

ON THE VERGE OF HUMILIATION. But the importance of establishing a precedent of peaceful arbitration is of greater importance to the interests of civilization than the temporary chagrin which the present situation may involve.

CONTINUED ON TENTH PAGE.

A GALLANT DEED.

The Shipping and City of Marseilles Saved from Destruction by American Daring.

ALMOST ANOTHER BORDEAUX DISASTER.

An Italian Petroleum Ship, Surrounded with Vessels, Catches Fire at Midnight.

The Citizens Panic-Stricken with Terror.

AMERICANS TO THE RESCUE!

ON BOARD THE BURNING SHIP.

Twenty Boats in Single File Tow Her Out Into the Bay.

THE PERIL OVERPAST.

Joy and Gratitude of the People.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

The HERALD correspondent at London has forwarded us the following special despatch:—

LONDON, May 24, 1872.

Full and complete despatches have been received at last in reference to the gallant conduct of the officers and sailors of the American squadron at Marseilles in the latter part of last month.

SAVING A CITY.

They achieved one of those splendid victories of peace which bring greener laurels than any that are won in war. By their discipline, skill and intrepidity the shipping in the harbor of that port was saved from certain destruction, and it is more than probable that but for their gallantry the flames would have also spread to the city, when the horrors of Chicago might have been repeated, since French cities are deplorably defective in agencies for the control and extinguishment of fires.

BEGINNING OF THE FIRE.

The American squadron—consisting of the Wabash, Congress, Brooklyn, Plymouth, Shenandoah, Juniata and Wachusett, under the command of Admiral Alden—were at the time lying in the Napoleon Basin, surrounded by almost innumerable merchantmen, embracing every description of craft and nationality. The night was fine, the sea calm, and there was a little moonlight. Suddenly, just after midnight, an explosion started the fleet and the city, and the awakened people beheld, with alarm and dismay, dense clouds of heavy smoke rising from the burning hull of an Italian ship which had just arrived from Philadelphia with a cargo of petroleum and had in some way got ablaze.

THE DANGER.

With the memory of the great fire at Bordeaux (which originated in precisely the same way) still fresh in their minds, the citizens fully realized the nature of the danger that now threatened them. So closely were the merchantmen huddled together that it seemed impossible to prevent the flames spreading, as at Bordeaux, through the rest of the fleet and thence to the wharves and city, especially as the houses came right down to the front of the harbor. Crowds of anxious men gathered along the shores and gazed at the peril that menaced them in panic-stricken, fascinated horror.

AMERICANS TO THE RESCUE.

But while the Frenchmen were thus paralyzed with fright the Americans, also sensible of the danger, took instant measures to avert the coming disaster. The flames on board the ill-fated ship were spreading with fearful rapidity and illuminated with sinister glare the shipping, the quays and the faces of the terror-stricken thousands who had rushed down to the water's edge. When the consternation was at its height the bugles on board the American fleet were heard calling away the boats, with the familiar tunes that seemed so strangely out of place at such a moment. Presently a twelve-oared cutter was seen to push away from the squadron and speed with lusty strokes toward the burning ship; then another and another; then a cluster of ten or more, until twenty boats, almost all that Admiral Alden had under his command, had been despatched on the pressing, dangerous order of saving fear-wrapped Marseilles.

OUR BOYS BATTLING THE FLAMES.

In a few minutes the first boat which put off gained the windward side of the burning vessel and, quick as thought, were seen to scramble on board, like cats, and move, as it seemed, amid the very flames. The other boats were soon alongside and the admirable plan of the officers was at once put into execution. Crew after crew of the boats were seen to board the vessel. Others of the boats seemed hovering along the ship's side. On shore there was a dead silence, but through the smothered roar and crackling of the fire could be heard the clear, firm orders from the American officers in command, succeeded by the blows of axes.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN.

But the panic-stricken spectators on shore still had no idea of the plan by which the danger was to be turned aside. The impossibility of escape was anxiously canvassed, and men saw in imagination the flaming oil floating away from the doomed ship and igniting the neighboring craft, until the whole surface of the basin should be covered with blazing oil and burning wrecks.

YANKEE BRAINS AND YANKEE PLUCK.

The plan of the Americans was first to cut the ship, next to cast loose the moorings, and thirly to tow her as far out into the bay as possible before she sank. This could not be appreciated at the time by those on shore; but how admirably American brains and discipline told that night is in the sequel. When it was well assured that the timbers had been sufficiently pierced to insure her sinking the boats were seen to form in single file, lashed securely together stem to stern. A hawser was passed out over the bow of the ship and made fast to the sternmost boat.

THE CRISIS OF THE PERIL.

The excitement rose still higher as the Italian slowly settled down into the water till her deck was almost level with the surface of the water. All the arrangements having been completed, the single file of American boats, lashed stem and stern, were seen pulling bravely away, and as the line straightened the burning ship also slowly moved out towards the bay, towed irresistibly forward by 200 sturdy American oars.

SAVED.

It was clear now that the peril was over, and an immense cheer of delight and gratitude broke from the assembled citizens. The Americans kept on rowing until the burning vessel sunk, and though there was here and there a little pool of flaming oil upon the waves, no further disaster occurred, owing to the distance between the fire and the vessels.

JOY AND GRATITUDE.

The next day the Americans were the recipients of the warmest praise from all sides. The people expressed at once admiration at the ingenuity and daring of the plan of action adopted and gratitude for the relief it had brought them.

SPAIN.

Amadeus' Cabinet Difficulty Continued—His Majesty's Trouble in Finding a Premier—The Carlist Agitation.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

MADRID, May 24, 1872.

There is no change in the ministerial situation. The members of the present Cabinet insist upon their resignations. Señor Zabala, who was called upon by King Amadeus to form a new ministry, has declined to do so, owing to ill health. His Majesty has now requested Marshal Serrano to undertake the task.

Carlist Active at Certain Points.

MADRID, May 24, 1872.

Numbers of Carlists continue to surrender to the government troops. In some of the disaffected provinces, however, fresh bands of insurgents have appeared within the past few days. Though small, they are very active, and have cut the telegraph wires in various directions.

ENGLAND.

Condition of the Crops and Prospects of the Harvest—American Triumph in Opera.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

LONDON, May 24, 1872.

The weather throughout England is fair, but unfavorable to the crops.

THE AMERICAN PRIMA DONNA IN OPERA.

Miss Kellogg made her fourth appearance last night at Her Majesty's Opera, Drury lane, in the rôle of Lucia di Lammermoor. The house was crowded and the lady was enthusiastically applauded. The critics continue to praise both the acting and the singing of the American prima donna.

DEATH OF AN AGED SOLDIER.

General Graves, who was present at the battle of New Orleans in 1815, is dead.

QUEEN VICTORIA.

Her Majesty's Birthday—Anniversary Celebrations.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

LONDON, May 24, 1872.

The anniversary of Queen Victoria's birthday was observed to-day at Windsor with suitable court festivities.

The celebration in this city will take place on Saturday, June 1, by which time the Prince and Princess of Wales will have reached home and be able to take part in the festival.

The Queen is fifty-three years of age. She was born May 24, in the year 1819.

THE FRENCH BAND FOR BOSTON.

Embarkation of the Musicians at Havre.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

PARIS, May 24, 1872.

The band of the Garde Republicaine, which is to assist at the World's Jubilee at Boston, sailed to-day on the steamship St. Laurent from Havre for New York.

THE ATALANTAS.

The Day of Contest Fixed—The New Boat—Practice and Splendid Performance.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

LONDON, May 24, 1872.

The Atalanta and London crews have agreed upon the 10th of June as the day for the race and half-past four o'clock P. M. as the hour for the start.

The new boat ordered by the Atalantas is being made by Biffin, and will be completed by Wednesday next.

The Pall Mall Gazette says the American crew now pull in a style which is simply perfection, and that between it and the Londoners the difference is plainly visible.

AFFAIRS IN MORMON LAND.

SALT LAKE CITY, May 24, 1872.

The women of Utah are preparing another memorial to Congress against the admission of Utah as a State and against the domination of the Mormon Church.

The bodies of several unfortunate persons who have been buried in snow avalanches during the winter have been recovered.

A great deal of interest is manifested in the approaching Democratic Convention for the election of delegates to the Baltimore Convention. Appearances indicate that the Convention will oppose Greeley and Brown.

NAPOLÉON.

His Ex-Majesty's Exposition of the Surrender at Sedan.

Heroism of the French Troops and Terrible Losses of the Army—The Immolation of the Whole Force Could Not Save France—A Sovereign's Truce, with "Broken Heart" but "Tranquil Conscience."

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

PARIS, May 24, 1872.

The *Canot* publishes a letter from the Emperor Napoleon, dated Chislehurst, May 14, and addressed to the generals and commanders of the French army.

In this communication the Emperor makes the following acknowledgments:—"I am responsible for Sedan. The army fought heroically, with an enemy double its strength. After 14,000 had been killed or wounded I saw that the contest was merely one of desperation. The army's honor having been saved, I exercised my sovereign right and unfurled the flag of truce. It was impossible that the immolation of 60,000 men could save France. I obeyed a cruel, inexorable necessity. My heart was broken, but my conscience was tranquil."

FRANCE.

The Specie Supply—Miss Nellie Grant's Visit.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

PARIS, May 24, 1872.

The specie in the Bank of France has increased 3,000,000 francs during the past week. Miss Nellie Grant is in the Parliament House. Miss Nellie Grant was among the visitors present in the gallery of the French Assembly during the debate Wednesday.

AUSTRIA.

The Emperor's Mother Dangerously Ill.

TELEGRAM TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

VIENNA, May 24, 1872.